

Lin, Cindy

From: Cindy Lin <Lin.Cindy@epamail.epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 14, 2014 3:53 PM
To: Lin, Cindy
Subject: Fw: Re: Jan mentioned you called . . .

Cindy Lin, D.ENV.
Water Division
US EPA R9 Southern CA Office
600 Wilshire Blvd, Ste 1460
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Office: 213.244.1803 Cell: 858.699.1255

-----Forwarded by Cindy Lin/R9/USEPA/US on 03/14/2014 03:52PM -----

To: "Orton, Randal" <ROrton@LVMWD.com>
From: Cindy Lin/R9/USEPA/US
Date: 10/25/2012 10:36AM
Subject: Re: Jan mentioned you called . . .

Hi Randal,


Thanks for your email and the kudos. It is a difficult process and the one thing I want to accomplish is to ensure that we have the information correct. The policies may be different, but it's important to me that the technical information is generally there and on target. I appreciate any comments as I see that as a way to improve this TMDL and set up a framework to move to the next steps.

I am out next week, but if you have time, we can chat this afternoon or tomorrow sometime.

Cindy



Cindy Lin, D. ENV.
US EPA R9 Southern CA Office
600 Wilshire Blvd, Ste 1460
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Office: 213.244.1803 Cell: 858.699.1255

 "Orton, Randal" ---10/24/2012 06:28:38 PM---. . . and believe it or not this is the first chance I've had to get back to you. I'll skip the awf

From: "Orton, Randal" <ROrton@LVMWD.com>
To: Cindy Lin/R9/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 10/24/2012 06:28 PM
Subject: Jan mentioned you called . . .

. . . and believe it or not this is the first chance I've had to get back to you. I'll skip the awful details as I imagine your schedule's no less hectic than mine.

Would you like to pick a time later this week or early next to talk about the TMDL? Jan mentioned you had concerns about (re)approaching the court and two other items. On the extension question I am currently waiting on some information on process, which I expected today but don't see in my in-box, so Friday afternoon or early next week might be better than tomorrow if you wanted to discuss it ASAP.

Aside from the request to seek an extension, I know our comment letter also covered a lot of technical ground that probably could have been stated or worded better, so definitely apologies to you and your consultant for the letter's focus on critique. It's a weak excuse but a true excuse that in trying to get our thoughts back to you fast I tended to fall into "tech review" writing mode, i.e. no need to comment on material unless we see or think we see a problem.

But from a professional perspective there most definitively is a need to provide positive feedback. If nothing else, you guys deserve kudos for even attempting to do a two-linkage TMDL under *any* kind of court deadline, especially one involving biological metrics. But kudos are cheap, so . . . perhaps 20 cents to the public service of your choice for every time I use the word "Monterey" or "geology" between now and March 24th? Seriously, though, Cindy, if any part of our critique seemed other than constructive, or simply ill-toned, apologies. It's a very technical exercise, and none of it is easy, or simple.

Randal